



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,400	04/17/2001	George Hamilton Harvey	52090.000376	5160

7590 10/06/2005

Thomas J. Scott, Jr., Esq.  
Hunton & Williams  
Suite 1200  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, WA 20006

EXAMINER

SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/835,400	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HARVEY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Lamont M. Spooner	<b>Art Unit</b> 2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 April 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. The Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 35 USC 102, been fully considered and are persuasive, at least because Ausborn does not: group a plurality of roots selected from a set of roots to form a word (claim 1), represent all concepts (claim 8), have a root including a most significant field in which the readable value designates a general abstract concept and field in which the readable value designates a narrower concept (claim 14, wherein the readable values are identical), have an each field represented by bits of data forming words (claim 18), have a plurality of fields representing subclass of the general abstract class of ideas (claim 21), have each word root forming the word (claim 24) . Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 4, [2], line 1, "The word 10" is objected to, "10" is not a word, and there is not location in the drawings that indicates the assumed reference numeral. In [9], lines 1-3, "In Figure 3, ...an "electronics teacher" may be represented by an alternate root of teaching, a base root of worker, a destination..." The drawings do not reflect this information accurately. In line 7, "It is can also be" is grammatically incorrect. In [12] line 6, "In the illustrated example, "cat" has five roots." The Examiner is unable to locate cat in any illustrated example.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show several alleged “illustrated” features, (for example in Fig. 1, the reference to item 10) as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 1, 14, 16, 22, and 26 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Art Unit: 2654

In claim 1, line 7, "plurality roots" should probably be - -plurality of roots- -.

In claim 14, line 3, "each field" has ambiguity issues, wherein - -each of the fields- - or - -each of the plurality of fields- - would resolve the issue, in lines 8 and 9, "the root" should probably be "in the root".

In claim 16, line 2, "definitionan" should probably be - -definitional- -.

In claim 22, p.18, line 5, "representing subclass" should probably be - -representing a subclass- - or - -representing subclasses- -, in line 3, "a plurality of fields" should probably be - -the plurality of fields- -. In claim 26, "the characteristic of represented by" should probably be - -the characteristic represented by- -.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. <sup>1/2 18)</sup> Claims 1-13, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the disclosure in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In claim 1, lines 8 and 7, "grouping a plurality roots selected from the set of roots to form a word" is not enabled by the spec. The Examiner is unable to determine from the disclosure how the word is formed, from the roots. More specifically, in

Art Unit: 2654

the disclosure, specification, page 6, para [7], lines 1 and 2, "Roots are combined to define words", page 7, para [8] line 6-9, "by combining roots in this multidimensional manner, each value for each field has significant meaning.

Each root narrows the meaning of each word, yet each root may be processed in a similar manner and in parallel to extract the meaning of the word". Page 9, [12], line 1, "Each word is comprised of roots that provide meaning to the words.". The Examiner notes that the combined roots do not form a word in any of the broadest sense of interpretation, wherein the forming of a word comprises generating the word and not the definition or meanings or grouped meanings of the word. The Examiner advises the applicant to specify where in disclosure a word is formed from the roots.

Claims 18, 24-27 set forth similar limitations and therefore rejected for the same reasons and under the same rationale. Claims 2-7, and 28 are rejected as being dependent upon their rejected parent claims.

In claim 8, "A method of representing all concepts" is without bound, wherein the applicant does not provide enablement for "all" concepts known to mankind.

Claims 9-13 are rejected as being dependent upon their rejected parent claim.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. <sup>is 12</sup> Claims 6, 14-23, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2654

In claim 18, line 2, "a processor including a register for simultaneously receiving bits of data" is unclear and confusing. The Examiner is unable to determine what is "simultaneous" or simultaneously occurring.

In claim 14, line 6, "the readable value" renders the claim inconclusive. The Examiner is unable to decipher if the readable value is the same readable value given to the most significant field, or a different readable value.

Claims 15-17, and 19-20 are rejected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim

9. In claim 6, line 3, "the tree-type taxonomy" lacks antecedent basis. In claim 9, lines 1 and 3, "the word" lacks antecedent basis. In claim 12, "the negative" lacks antecedent basis. In claim 21, p.18, line 5, "the general abstract class" lacks antecedent basis. In claim 27, "the step of combining" lacks antecedent basis. In claim 28, "the step of combining" lacks antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected as being dependent upon a rejected parent claim

### ***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571/272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lms  
9/29/05

Donald L. Storm  
PATENT EXAMINER  
AU 2654